

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the present application. Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-3, 5-20, and 22-25 were pending in the present application. Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1-3, 6-20, and 22-25 are now pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 15 are independent claims. Claims 2, 3, 6-14, 19, 20, 22, and 25 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Claims 16-18, 23, and 24 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 15.

**Claim Amendments**

Claims 1, 6, and 15 have been amended by way of this reply. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to more precisely claim the present invention. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 15 can be found, for example, in Fig. 1. Claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the cleaning liquid does not mix within the receiving device. Support for the amendment to claim 6 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0035]. Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added by way of the amendments.

**Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to for not showing a nozzle insert blocking the cleaning liquid coming from one inlet of the at least two inlets, as recited in claim 5. Claim 5 has been canceled. Thus, the objection is now moot.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1-3, 5-20, and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the term “with a single member” recited in claims 1 and 15 “appears to be new matter. Nowhere in the specification does it say that valve controls the flow with a single moving member. In fact, from the figures, it appears that there are at least two moving members in the valve that control the flow through the at least two inlets, the member 32 and spring element 34.” The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Figure 1 clearly shows a single moving member 32 whose movement controls the flow through two inlets 18, 20. That is, when the single moving member 32 is in one position, the single moving member 32 blocks liquid flow to inlet 18 and allows liquid flow to inlet 20. When the single member 32 is in another position, the single member allows liquid flow to inlet 18 and blocks liquid flow to inlet 20. Thus, the single moving member 32 clearly controls liquid flow through at least two inlets. Because of the open ended claim language, the claim does not exclude a valve having more than the single moving member 32 therein, as long as the valve has *a single moving member which controls liquid flow through at least two inlets*. The claims do not require that there is only a single moving member in the valve. Instead, the claims require

that a single moving member controls liquid flow through at least two inlets, which the single moving member 32 clearly accomplishes. The spring element 34, which is part of a mechanism by which the single moving member 32 operates, is not excluded by the claim language.

Claims 5 and 6 of the present application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the term “the nozzle insert blocks the cleaning liquid coming from one of the inlets” in claim 5 is unclear, and that the term “the cleaning liquid coming from one inlet of the at least two inlets does not mix with the cleaning liquid coming from another inlet of the at least two inlets” is unclear, because “once the cleaning liquid hits the target, cleaning liquid from both inlets is bound to mix.”

Claim 5 has been canceled. Thus, the rejection of claim 5 is now moot. In view of the rejection, claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the cleaning liquid from one inlet does not mix with the cleaning liquid from another inlet *within the receiving device*. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 15-20, and 22-24 of the present application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,113,006 (“Walker”). Claims 1 and 15 have been amended by way of this reply. To the extent that the rejection may still apply, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 15, as amended, require, in part, that “the valve controls liquid flow through the at least two inlets with a single moving member,” and that “the single moving

member is operable to block liquid flow to one of the two inlets while allowing liquid flow through another of the two inlets.”

Walker discloses a nozzle for a vehicle window washing system having a check ball 86 that blocks or allows liquid flow through a single passage in the form of a second bore 78, which eventually splits into two passages in the form of inlets for discharge bores 30. When the check ball 86 is in one position, the check ball 86 blocks liquid flow to both inlets for the discharge bores 30, while in another position, the check ball 86 allows liquid flow to both inlets for the discharge bores 30. Although the check ball 86 does simultaneously allow liquid flow through two inlets or simultaneously block liquid flow through two inlets, the check ball is not operable to block liquid flow to only one of the two inlets, *while* allowing liquid flow through the second of the two inlets.

In view of the above, claims 1 and 15 are patentable over Walker, at least for the above reasons. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 16-20, and 22-24 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 or 15. Thus, claims 2, 3, 6-7, 12, 13, 15-20, and 22-25 are patentable over Walker, at least for the same reasons as claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 8-10, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0234303 (“Berning”). Claim 1, from which claims 8-10 and 14 depend, has been amended. To the extent that the rejection applies to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Walker. Further, Berning fails to supply that which Walker lacks, as evidenced by the fact that Berning is only relied upon to disclose the nozzle insert having whirl chambers formed together with at least one wall of the receiving device and each connected to separate inlets. (See lines 1-8 on page 7 of the Office Action) Berning does not show or suggest separate flow paths, and thus fails to provide that which Walker lacks with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Berning neither shows nor suggests the single moving member being operable to block liquid flow to one of the two inlets while allowing liquid flow through another of the two inlets, as required by amended claim 1.

In view of the above, Walker and Berning, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Walker and Berning, at least for the above reasons. Claims 8-10, 13, and 14 are dependent from claim 1. Thus, claims 8-10, 13, and 14 are patentable over Walker and Berning, at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,082,636 ("Yoshida"). Claim 1, from which claim 11 depends, has been amended. To the extent that the rejection applies to the amended claim, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, claim 1 is patentable over Walker. Further, Yoshida fails to supply that which Walker lacks. Yoshida discloses a washer nozzle assembly having an upper

lip portion defining a nozzle opening extending further forward than the lower lip portion so that the part of the washer liquid directed upward is blocked by the longer upper lip portion. Yoshida does not teach or suggest separate flow paths, and thus fails to provide that which Walker lacks with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Yoshida neither shows nor suggests the single moving member being operable to block liquid flow to one of the two inlets while allowing liquid flow through another of the two inlets, as required by amended independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Walker and Yoshida, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Walker and Yoshida, at least for the above reasons. Claim 11 is dependent from claim 1. Thus, claim 11 is patentable over Walker and Yoshida, at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 15-20, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,402,052 ("Murawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,927,601 ("Martin"). Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. To the extent that the rejection applies to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 15, as amended, require, in part, that "the valve controls liquid flow through the at least two inlets with a single moving member," and that "the single moving member is operable to block liquid flow to one of the two inlets while allowing liquid flow through another of the two inlets."

Murawa discloses a pressure sensitive windshield washer nozzle. With reference to the nozzle embodiment shown in Figure 3 in Murawa, the apparatus has two movable pressure flow control valves 110, 112, each with movable ball checks 116a, 116b disposed therein. A low pressure flow control valve 110 controls liquid flow through one flow path 122a with a first movable ball check 116a, while a high pressure flow control valve 112 controls liquid flow through the other flow path 122b with a second movable ball check 116b. That is, Murawa teaches a nozzle in which each moving member 116a, 116b controls liquid flow through only one inlet. Thus, Murawa fails to show or suggest at least the valve controls liquid flow through the at least two inlets with a single moving member.

Martin discloses a valve having a valve stopper 19. With reference to the valve embodiment shown in Figure 9 in Martin, when the valve stopper 19 is in one position, the valve stopper 19 blocks liquid flow to both horizontal and vertical outlets 42, 43, while in another position, the valve stopper 19 allows liquid flow to both horizontal and vertical outlets 42, 43. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to substitute the valve of Martin for the valve of Murawa, "thereby connecting the outputs of Martin et al.'s valve to the inputs of the receiving device of Murawa, in order to allow liquid cleaner to enter the receiving device only when the circulator pump is functioning, as taught by Martin et al."

In the valve of Martin, although the valve stopper 19 does simultaneously allow liquid flow through two outlets or simultaneously block liquid flow through two outlets, the valve stopper 19 is not operable to block liquid flow to only one of the two inlets, *while* allowing liquid flow through another of the two inlets. If the valve of Martin is incorporated into Murawa such that one of the outlets 42, 43 empties into one of Murawa's flow paths 122a, 122b, and the other

of the outlets 42, 43 empties into the other of Murawa's flow paths 122a, 122b, the combined valve would not have a single moving member that is operable to block liquid flow to one of the two inlets while allowing liquid flow through another of the two inlets, as required by the amended claims.

In view of the above, Murawa and Martin, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 15. Thus, independent claims 1 and 15 are patentable over Murawa and Martin, at least for the above reasons. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 16-20, and 21-25 are dependent from claim 1 or 15. Thus, claims 2-3, 6-7, 16-20, and 21-25 are patentable over Murawa and Martin, at least for the same reasons as claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Murawa in view of Martin and Berning. Claim 1, from which claims 8-10 and 14 depend, has been amended. To the extent that the rejection applies to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Murawa and Martin. Further, Berning fails to supply that which Walker lacks, as evidenced by the fact that Berning is only relied upon to disclose the nozzle insert having whirl chambers formed together with at least one wall of the receiving device and each connected to separate inlets. (See lines 1-8 on page 7 of the Office Action) Berning does not show or suggest separate flow paths, and thus fails to provide that which Murawa and Martin lack with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Berning neither shows nor suggests the single moving member being operable to block liquid



flow to one of the two inlets while allowing liquid flow through another of the two inlets, as required by amended independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Murawa and Martin and Berning, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Murawa, Martin, and Berning, at least for the above reasons. Claims 8-10, 13, and 14 are dependent from claim 1. Thus, claims 8-10, 13, and 14 are patentable over Murawa, Martin, and Berning, at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Murawa in view of Martin and Yoshida. Claim 1, from which claim 11 depends, has been amended. To the extent that the rejection applies to the amended claim, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, claim 1 is patentable over Murawa and Martin. Further, Yoshida fails to supply that which Murawa and Martin lack. Yoshida discloses a washer nozzle assembly having an upper lip portion defining a nozzle opening extending further forward than the lower lip portion so that the part of the washer liquid directed upward is blocked by the longer upper lip portion. Yoshida does not teach or suggest separate flow paths, and thus fails to provide that which Murawa and Martin lack with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Yoshida neither shows nor suggests the single moving member being operable to block liquid flow to one of the two inlets while allowing liquid flow through another of the two inlets, as required by amended independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Murawa, Martin, and Yoshida, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Murawa, Martin, and Yoshida, at least for the above reasons. Claim 11 is dependent from claim 1. Thus, claim 11 is patentable over Murawa, Martin and Yoshida, at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account No. 50-0591, under Order No. 17102/012001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: November 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Jonathan P. Osha  
Registration No.: 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant